

PARTY AFFAIRS

A PUBLICATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.
23 West 26th Street, New York, N.Y. 10010

Vol. VII No. 4

209

Sept.-Oct. 1973


A Constitution which opens a Window on the future

By Joseph Felshin, N.Y., N.Y.

The latest literature packet received for distribution to the members of my Party club contained a number of copies of the Constitution of the Communist Party, U.S.A. It was the new printing of the Constitution as amended and revised by our Party's last convention

Pamphlet No. 1 Price 10c

Manifesto and Program
CONSTITUTION
REPORT TO THE COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL



Communist Party of America
Chicago, Ill.
Our first Constitution in 1919

CONSTITUTION
of the
COMMUNIST
PARTY
of the
UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

Our Constitution as amended by the 20th
Convention

In This Issue

	Page
A Constitution Which Opens a Window on the Future, Joseph Felshin.	1
Report on Petty Bourgeois Radicalism, Mike Zagarell	6
A "Coming Out" for the Party (Party Affairs Interview):	26
Labor and Political Action: Canada and the U.S., George Meyers	31
DuBois vs. Padmore and Washington, Naside Henderson	40
Party Shop Papers - A Personal, Direct Approach, LJB	47
Immediate Action on Chile	48

in February of last year and just issued in an edition of ten thousand. A pamphlet such as this should not be treated as just another "piece of literature" to be handled in the usual routine manner.

But, far from being routine, what I had received was an intensely exciting, dramatic, in a sense historic "piece of literature." Between the covers of this 32-page pamphlet was nothing less than the basic charter of political and organizational rules and principles that guide the most advanced organization in the U.S.A. today -- The Communist Party -- our Communist Party!

Not everyone may agree with this estimate. But then not everyone understands what to most Marxists is almost axiomatic, that all phenomena -- nations, parties, religions, institutions, armies, philosophies -- must be judged not by their seeming appearance of strength or weakness at the given moment in history but by whether they are growing, flourishing, expanding, or dwindling, diminishing, dying out. Not everyone realizes that every majority throughout history had to start off somewhere along the line as a minority, sometimes a very tiny minority of perhaps one or two or half a dozen. And few, all too few are aware that when Marx and Engels wrote the world-shaking Communist Manifesto one hundred and twenty five years ago there were no more than a few score communists in the whole world; there are more than sixty million today, many at the helm of great nations guiding their peoples on the path to communism.

That is why the publication of this edition of our Party's Constitution -- with its fresh new Preamble providing a clear sharp focus on class forces and relationships and on our Party's role and tasks in the class struggle -- must not be treated in a routine manner, as though it were purely an inner Party matter instead of a big event in the life of our Party, something which affects not only our Party but which brims over to touch the lives of all working people.

Exploitation! What anguish, what tears and blood are compressed into that one word, what immeasurable pain, fear, hunger have racked billions of impoverished masses through the centuries. What unspeakable cruelties have been inflicted by their capitalist taskmasters on all who dared rise up to resist the system of capitalist exploitation.

And now, here comes an organization -- "the political party of the working class" -- the Communist Party which proclaims that "Only through the abolition of the capitalist system and the socialist reorganization of society can exploitation of man by man be ended, and with it the evils of war, racism and poverty." The grandeur of it!

BANNER OF STRUGGLE AGAINST RACISM

"The struggle for equality for Black people and against racism... as well as the fighting unity of the working class... is central to all social progress," our Constitution states, a concept which carries forward the banner of struggle against racism raised high by Marx and Engels, by Lenin, by those Black liberation titans, Frederick Douglass and W.E.B. DuBois, and in today's conditions by a host of Black

Communist leaders including our own Henry Winston and Angela Davis. No other charter, not the Constitution of the United States nor its Bill of Rights encompasses such glorious goals, goals which open windows on the future of mankind.

The Constitution spells out the enormous scope of the Party's struggles -- "for improved living conditions, against the crushing burden of taxes, for better housing, health, education, child care, cultural and recreational facilities, the struggle of youth, the senior citizens and the farm laborers and small farmers for their special needs -- all these are our fight."

"In the course of daily struggle," the Constitution says, "the Communist Party works to increase the class consciousness and political independence of the working class to defeat the main instruments of capitalist division, racism and anti-communism, and to bring the workers to the leadership of a growing people's alliance of all class and social strata whose interests clash with those of the monopolies."

And what is the compass which guides the Party in the task of organizing its own forces and those of the working class and its allies in the struggle "to curb the power of monopoly and proceed to take power and build socialism"? The Constitution answers this question: "Using the science of society known as Marxism-Leninism and the organizational principle of democratic centralism, the Communist Party is able to make a unique contribution to the strength of the working class and people at every stage of the struggle."

It continues in words that seem carved in rock: "The historic cause of the working class...is the cause of all working people and therefore of all humanity...The historic destiny of the working class is, in alliance with all working people, to replace capitalist exploitation and oppression by a socialist system of common effort for the common good."

From the outset, immediately following "Name" and "Purposes," again and again the Constitution stresses the democratic essence of its "Principles of Organization." "The system of organization of the Communist Party is based on the principle of democratic centralism which guarantees the unity of will and action of the membership and leadership."

"Democratic centralism combines the maximum involvement... with responsible direction..." It reiterates further that "The principle of democratic centralism includes a common discipline for all members and leaders to fulfill the decisions arrived at by the majority."

"Election of leadership at all levels," it declares, "shall be carried through with the fullest participation of the membership on the basis of a critical review of the work and policies of the Party and of a critical evaluation of all leading committees and individuals." "Leading committees," the Constitution points

out, "are responsible to those who elected them and are subject to recall."

Further emphasizing its democratic content, it states: "Discipline is voluntarily assumed by members of the Party based on conviction, understanding and devotion to the cause to which the Party dedicates its efforts." And it reaffirms again, in the article under "Membership," that "Membership in the Communist Party is a voluntary act of the individual."

"The Rights and Duties of Members," as defined by the Constitution calls on Communist Party members "...to participate in the making of its policies and in their execution, and in the election of its leading committees, officers and delegates." Included also is the right to "criticize the work of all leading committees and individual leaders, irrespective of the positions they hold, for shortcomings, errors or unbecoming conduct." That this right is held inviolate is attested to by the fact that "An officer who interferes with this right of criticism shall be subject to discipline."

BUILD THE COMMUNIST PARTY

What about the duties that Party members assume? These lie at the heart of the Constitution which states: "Members shall strive to improve continually their political knowledge and their understanding of Marxism-Leninism, to take part in the discussion of Party policy, to initiate activities, to work for the aims and policies of the Party, and to seek to win new members to its ranks."

To seek to win new members to its ranks! This is, in a sense, the central core of our Constitution. Earlier this year, a meeting of our Central Committee, launching an intensive national recruiting campaign, heard splendid reports on Party building by Comrades Winston, Rubin, Jackson, Helen Winter and many others. In his major report to the gathering, Comrade Gus Hall put his finger on one of the crucial problems of building the Party. He reminded his listeners, most of them seasoned in decades of class battles, that no matter how great the Party's achievements, no matter how often the struggles it organizes lead to victory, no matter how decisive its triumphs on one front or another -- trade union, Black liberation, peace, civil rights, welfare -- these achievements and victories are quickly dissipated, vanish like smoke in thin air unless the Party recruits, unless, as our Constitution puts it, our Party is able "to win new members to its ranks."

Our Constitution puts in our hands a marvelous instrument for recruiting. Just imagine tapping a fellow worker in your shop (it could just as well be a friend, neighbor, even a casual acquaintance) on the shoulder and saying: "Tom (or Sam or Mary or José), I've got something for you. It's real inside stuff. You know you've heard a lot about the Communist Party. Well, here's a copy of their own Constitution. Tells you how it operates, what makes

it tick, what it's trying to do, yes, and why the government bigshots hate it so much. Tom, the newspapers write a lot about the communists but they never tell you what's in this little booklet. Take it home and read it. We'll talk about it some more tomorrow."

THE SPIRIT OF WORKING CLASS INTERNATIONALISM

One more word about our Constitution, particularly on what it has to say about our Party's internationalism. The Preamble states that the Party "recognizes and fights for identity of interests among workers of all lands, an identity which is also in the true national interests of each country."

In this context, a document titled Humanist Manifesto II was released with considerable fanfare and wide acclaim in the bourgeois press a few weeks ago by an international group of prominent intellectuals and liberals. The document listed a number of liberal goals and causes, including some of merit, to which the signers of the document are seeking to rally support internationally. But when one cuts through the layers of high-sounding humanitarian rhetoric, what do the liberal pretensions of Manifesto II add up to? It evolves as a despicable, slanderous onslaught against the Soviet Union, an unprincipled ideological attack which dares to equate the mighty citadel of socialism, of peace, of national liberation -- the USSR -- with U.S. imperialism, chief banker and bulwark of world reaction today. And the sweet-mouthed humanitarian talk, it turns out, is honey to draw flies, bait to win signatures of honest progressives, among whom some have fought for decades in the cause of American-Soviet friendship and in defense of socialism. One cannot but wonder: did the Manifesto II crew get their lines from the notorious renegade from socialism, Andrei Sakharov, latest hero of the "free world," or was it vice versa? Until one realizes that both are instruments, both spout the line of the same imperialist masters, the big U.S. and international monopolies.

Contrast this with our Party's Constitution which proudly affirms its "spirit of working class internationalism," which declares forthrightly that "the Communist Party cherishes its solidarity with the world communist movement and the socialist countries, especially with the first country of socialism, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

What a grand and glorious Constitution we have!

* * *

TO ALL DISTRICT AND CLUB EDUCATIONAL DIRECTORS:

The report on the following pages, Report on Petty Bourgeois Radicalism, is rich in material for club educational discussions. We strongly urge that all clubs schedule discussions using the material from the report, encouraging all comrades to read the report, and that your discussions include your experiences with petty bourgeois organizations and their ideology, estimate their influence in your area, and how the Party can better combat it.

National Education Department

REPORT ON PETTY BOURGEOIS RADICALISM

Report to Political Committee, May 1973

By Mike Zagarell.

Over the past two to three years great changes have taken place in the struggle within the Left. Old organizations have disappeared and new ones have come into being, and with these changes have come new aspects of the struggle.

The main change in this period has been the collapse of the organized "new Left" movement with its ideology of American exceptionalism and its attempt to chart a so-called third course for the U.S. Left. To appreciate this collapse we need only recall the huge following of SDS which included over 30,000 members but is now gone from the student scene. Along with the SDS collapse is the collapse of the Black Panther Party which only a few short years ago was viewed as a leading force and inspiration of the Left.

In evaluating the setbacks of petty bourgeois radicalism in the past years, decisive importance must be attached to the setbacks delivered to the ideologies of anarchism and terrorism which played so important a role in these movements. The fruitless deaths which have resulted from adventurist acts, the use of these by the Right, the growth of the labor upsurge, the international events in Chile, France, Bolivia, Vietnam, etc., and the internationalist position of the Soviet Union, combined with ideological attack from our Party - all these were strong factors undermining the petty bourgeois radical upsurge.

Not only has the international situation influenced the collapse of the "new Left" in the United States, but the collapse of the "new Left" in the United States is part of a general collapse of this trend throughout the world. This trend was influenced by Maoist policies which in turn based their hope on this "new Left" upsurge. The collapse of petty bourgeois Leftism on a world scale has forced the Maoists to reorient, to de-emphasize the terrorist aspects of their program and turn instead to more openly Right opportunist capitulation to U. S. imperialism against the Soviet Union. This new turn has greatly influenced the rhetoric and tactics of the petty bourgeois Left at home as well as its base.

In summing up the past two years, we can say that the petty bourgeois Left has greatly declined, yet segments of it have become more solidified in more ideologically defined organizations. These organizations are now growing. "New Left" ideology -- the idea of a third course -- is decimated, and these trends have now retreated to using Marxist rhetoric to attack Marxism. Anarchism and terrorism, while not dead, are badly discredited and even the Maoists now try to cover up this aspect of their program. In verbiage there is a recognition of the working class (few now openly attack the working class). Yet in essence the same line continues; attack on democratic struggle and united front, anti-Sovietism

anti-labor approaches and attack on the fight for multi-national unity.

In the petty bourgeois Left there are now three major trends:

1. Trotskyism - Represented by the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), Young Socialist Alliance (YSA), Worker's World, Youth Against War and Fascism (YAWF), National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC) and Progressive Labor (PL). While PL does not proclaim that it is Trotskyite, it has publicly rejected Maoism and adheres to views which are, in fact, Trotskyist.

2. Maoism - Represented by Nov. 4 Coalition, The Guardian, Revolutionary Union (RU), Black Workers Congress (BWC), Puerto Rican Workers Organization (PRWO) and the Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP). The PSP reflects Maoism in a more hidden and shame-faced form.

3. Neo-Pan Africanists - Represented by Congress of African People (CAP), Stokely Carmichael.

The Black Panther Party is a fourth group which really is not in any of the above.

TROTSKYISM

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY-YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE

The SWP-YSA is the largest Trotskyite grouping in the country. It now has roughly 2,000-2,500 members. It is organized in 28 states and approximately 60 cities. The overwhelming base is on college campuses, probably 1,500-1,800 in YSA and 500-600 in SWP. Its racial composition is overwhelmingly white, and indications are that it is losing ground among Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican youth. As we know, the SWP-YSA more than tripled its membership in its "peace actions" in the last five years. The weekly circulation of their paper, The Militant, according to their claims, is 25,000. This is an increase over 1969 when they claimed their circulation was 10,000. Over the past year they claim to have gotten 35,000 introductory subs at 3 months for \$1 (25¢). They are aiming to increase their introductory sales by 7,000 per week by the end of the year.

Nevertheless, despite past growth and big projections, indications are that they are slipping into deep problems. Firstly, the SWP has based itself entirely on the now ebbing student movement. Secondly, within this movement they have based themselves on three issues: 1) the war in Vietnam; 2) the abortion struggle and 3) gay liberation. At present, the war in Vietnam has receded, and the abortion struggle has been in a lull due to the Supreme Court decision. This leaves them with gay liberation for an issue. The Militant has reflected now for some months a casting about looking for something else to hang its hat on. At present this is

somewhat relieved by the elections to which the SWP has committed all its resources to enter candidates in about ten cities.

Over the past years, one of the new factors has been the apparent ability of the SWP to emerge as a factor in the mass movement. This has been particularly reflected in the peace movement where the SWP had for a number of past years emerged in control of the National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC). Through NPAC, the SWP has greatly influenced the largest democratic movement in the U.S. Its ability to emerge as a factor in the movement reflects some new trends in the SWP as opposed to other Trotskyite groups. One of these is its move to the Right on a number of questions, uncritically aligning or even merging with liberal forces. Here one of its directions has been an attempt to fill the place left by the dying Socialist Party.

The keystone in this new drift is the SWP position on "transitional demands." Trotskyism has always denied democratic struggles, and has always attempted to function in every struggle as if it were fighting for socialism. This means traditionally that the Trotskyites are always incapable of participating in any reform struggle without trying to disrupt the basis of unity. The SWP has tactically modified this position by using the concept of "transitional demands." "Transitional demands" is defined by the SWP in their program for Black liberation. The key demands being raised in the Black liberation struggle today such as Black control of Black communities, jobs for all and self-determination have this quality of being "transitional" in nature. They are rooted in the needs of the present understanding of the Black community, yet they have a revolutionary logic because the capitalist system does not have the capacity to meet them. Accordingly, the SWP will only fight on "transitional demands." This is one of the main sources of their single issue approach to mass movements.

In some cases, this leads to Leftist conclusions of only fighting on the single demand even if masses don't see this demand, but lately it means a Rightist and tailist approach of blocking the struggle to unite movements and deepen class consciousness. It means that while, in the past, the Trotskyites were always manipulating to impose the fight for socialism on every movement, now the SWP completely opposes raising any questions in the mass movement except the one or two they have deemed "transitional." Thus they now want to limit the basis of unity to one or two points only. This particularly leads to the undermining of the struggle against racism. In fact, the movement level on Black-white unity is now ahead of their position.

Their basic underlying position is that the question is not class struggle, but social struggle. The real view of the SWP is that every section of the people faces transitional demands; the working class is just one of the groups among many which cannot solve its problems under capitalism. Thus, they project an alliance for socialism of which the working class is one force but not necessarily the leading force. No concept of fighting for the leading role of the working class is projected within each movement.

The task is simply to show everyone that you can't win transitional demands under capitalism. Thus the fight for class unity, against racism, for an independent class position in each movement is rejected.

While the underpinnings of the position are "Leftist," that is, that the fight for democracy can be co-opted and should be opposed, the practical effect is to unite the SWP with the liberals in the fight to keep the struggle within certain defined limits. On the surface it appears that the Trotskyites and the liberals start with opposite views on fundamentals but end up in alliance on tactical questions. But, in fact, they agree on many fundamentals. The SWP holds that the fight for democracy really can be solved under capitalism. This is the basic view of the liberals. In this aspect, the SWP has found an alliance with some of the liberals and sections of social democracy as well as the masses who are influenced by them.

The SWP has, with this position, cut out for themselves a piece of the democratic struggle in which they can stand and fight. When this piece of terrain from which they chose to fight coincides with the level of the masses, as it will from time to time, (as it did in the peace movement), they can emerge as a factor in the struggle. "Out Now" is an example of a transitional demand, one the SWP thinks cannot be won under capitalism, but one for which masses were willing to fight.

On the national question, they espouse nationalism. They state, "If you love revolution, you'll love nationalism," and "Nationalism is to Black people what class consciousness is to white workers."

Here, too, the SWP sees social struggle but not class struggle and denies the leading role of the working class, white and Black. They try to limit the consciousness of Black people to national consciousness which means to limit the key role of Black workers within the national movement, and to abandon them to the Black petty bourgeoisie.

As Lenin said, "The bourgeoisie always places its national demands in the forefront and does so in categorical fashion. With the proletariat, however, these demands are subordinated to the interests of the class struggle...the important thing for the proletariat is to ensure the development of its class. For the bourgeoisie it is important to hamper this development by pushing the aims of its 'own' nation before those of the proletariat." (Right of Nations to Self Determination)

Within the nationalist movement, the SWP sides with the Black petty bourgeoisie by helping it to hamper class consciousness and to subordinate the independent class position of Black workers. Its nationalist position, however, is really just a cover for racism. The key to developing class consciousness is the fight for Black-white unity, but this is precisely what the SWP opposes, and by opposing it, reveals its full racism. It opposes the fight for Black-

white unity except in struggle for socialism, which again reflects its opposition to the democratic front. "We no longer demand integration into imperialist America. We demand the right to separate from white America." (In Defense of Black Nationalism, by Tony Thomas)

The view that racial unity can only be achieved in the fight for socialism is expressed in the SWP's position of support for separate, independent parties for Black, white, and Brown, and seeing the SWP as the only possible Black, Brown and white party. While such a view is covered with Left phrases, the real meaning is to subordinate oppressed workers to the petty bourgeoisie and to identify white workers with the ruling class. When the SWP says Black nationalism is to Black people what class consciousness is to white workers, it would appear that the SWP is for building class consciousness among white workers. But this is not true. The SWP is opposed to developing class consciousness among white workers because without class unity there can be no class consciousness. The SWP says it is for unity in the fight for socialism. But socialist consciousness is a form of class consciousness, and there can be no class consciousness without a fight against racism. Thus the position of the SWP is simply to tail the petty bourgeoisie within the national movements and to tail the liberal bourgeoisie in the general democratic struggle. The racist position of the SWP is shown in the Canarsie situation where white SWP members chanted to Black parents "Black control of Black communities," when these parents were struggling for integrated schools. In their transitional demands there is no demand for Black students to get into white schools, etc., but only that Black people have control of separate communities. Under all the demogogy the position of the SWP is simply that Black people must stay in the ghetto.

On the question of women's equality, they have the same basic position. They state, "If you love revolution, you'll love feminism." They completely subordinate the working class women within the women's movement as well as advocate the separation of women's demands from Black and working class struggles. Their position is that capitalism can't meet the feminist demands, and therefore these are transitional demands that are safe to advocate because they won't be co-opted. The petty bourgeois character of their approach is shown in their opportunist support for the Equal Rights Amendment.

On gay liberation, they manipulate Marxism to a position that the family is reactionary and the main pillar of capitalism. They say that the male-female roles are based on continuation of the family and that gay liberation challenges the family and therefore challenges capitalism. Their position is incorrect, and based on a distortion of Engels, who wrote: "Having arisen from economic causes will monogamy then disappear when the causes disappear... far from disappearing, it will on the contrary, be fully realized... monogamy instead of collapsing, at last becomes a reality also for men." (Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State.)

Lenin, in a letter to Inessa Armand, listed ten possible meanings for the concept of free love. Her last three, 8, 9 and 10, were: freedom from serious problems in love; freedom from child-

birth; freedom that makes adultery possible. Lenin, commenting on these last three states that, in interpretation, one through seven would be characteristic for working class women, and 8, 9 and 10 for bourgeois women. Thus, Lenin also rejected the concept of dissolution of marriage as a petty bourgeois fad. Such a fad, in the end, only produces greater oppression of the working class. Gay liberation is part of this petty bourgeois fad. By advocating such a view, the SWP shows its complete lack of principles.

In conclusion, the SWP rejects the popular front. They assign leading roles in revolution to students, to women in general, Black people in general, etc., without placing the working class within these movements.

The SWP position on the working class can be summed up in the following:

"This 'new' organization is supposed to reflect the CP's current turn toward 'industrial concentration' (sending its members into 'heavy industry') by being a 'working class organization ... This turn towards the workers represents nothing more than a retreat by the CP and its youth from the living struggles of today, and an attempt to remove themselves from a movement in which the overwhelming majority of the activists have totally rejected the CP's reformist line." (Introduction to the Young Socialist Alliance, p. 11.)

Is the SWP now Social Democratic or Trotskyist? The difference is not always so great but it is important because we are for a united front with Social Democrats but against it with Trotskyites. Some comrades characterize the SWP as the "new Social Democrats". Indeed they have certain qualities of Social Democrats, but the main point is that the SWP opposes the democratic front. This means that when it does seek unity with the Party, it is unity against the democratic movement. We must therefore resolutely reject unity with the SWP. The SWP is a Trotskyite organization, although it has some Social Democratic aspects. The SWP, like most Trotskyite groups, is an eclectic hodge-podge of Left and Right opportunism.

While the SWP tries to fill the gap left by the Socialist Party other Trotskyite groups try to play the more traditional Trotskyite role.

NATIONAL CAUCUS OF LABOR COMMITTEES

The Labor Committee (LC) is a Trotskyite organization, but also a police organization. Some comrades feel uncomfortable about calling it a Trotskyite group but prefer to call it a police front. Others in the Left feel uncomfortable calling it a police outfit, but want to call it a Trotskyite group, which objectively aids the police. The LC is, in fact, both. There is no contradiction between the two. It is an alliance between the Trotskyites and the police which is part of the inherent role of Trotskyism. The posi-

tion of the LC and all other Trotskyite groups starts from the conviction that the CP and all democratic movements must be destroyed. The only difference between the Trotskyite groups is in the estimate of what is the best method. That is why other Trotskyite groups refuse to expose the ideology of the LC. That is why they do not want to, and in fact do not, challenge them as a "Left" group.

The LC is about two-three years old. It was formed from a group of SWP and Progressive Labor youth and now has about 200 members. Their membership is made up of wealthy youth, lumpen youth and police agents. Their paper, New Solidarity, has a circulation of about 20,000 per week, mostly through free distribution. Their paper is published at a cost of roughly \$90,000 per year. Considering their membership size, their lack of real activity, and the fact that they have no public fund raising affairs, it is obvious that they are funded by the enemy. In addition to New Solidarity, they are putting out their phoney NU-WRO newspaper.

Indications are that they are tied to CIA operations, through Columbia University, Brezinski and the 4th International. At present they have at least one person in 25 cities, but in many of these areas they seem to be paper organizations working out of P.O. boxes, with the only real bases existing in Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, New Jersey, Boston and some group in Seattle. At present their activities are totally limited to attacks on the CP and other progressive organizations. This is justified by their view that a depression is only a few months away. This depression will be the worst in history. It will result in socialism or fascism and they argue that this crisis will lead to socialism only if the CPUSA is first destroyed. Their paper uses normal Trotskyite arguments and slanders against the CP.

They are openly racist. They say all national movements are reactionary because they are democratic movements which cut across class lines. They refer to Lenin as "muddleheaded" on the national question. They take Rosa Luxemburg's position on class struggle and, under this banner, the NCLC supports Shanker. The NCLC organizes Black students to attack teachers who are anti-Shanker. The NCLC covers their position by agreeing on the need to support a union strike, but in Philadelphia where the union is more advanced the NCLC organizes Black students to attack teachers who are anti-Shanker. While they mention fascism they never mention racism as part of the fascist offensive. To the LC, the struggle against racism is a diversion.

It is interesting to note that the SWP takes a nationalist position and the LC attacks all national movements. These seem to be opposite positions but both draw their racist views from Trotskyism. The SWP opposes a democratic front and therefore also opposes Black-white unity, except in the fight for socialism. The NCLC argues against democratic struggle as well and therefore argues that the national movement will obscure the class movement.

The NCLC argues that labor unions have outlived their usefulness because the ruling class is now "recycling" labor through work-fare programs. That is, the ruling class causes unemployment and then it rehires the unemployed through forced work programs at lower wages only to employ new workers who will in turn replace other workers. The whole thing is a steady downhill spiral which will lead either to fascism or socialism. In the face of this problem, unions are powerless and have outlived their usefulness. What is needed is a class-wide organization of workers, unemployed and students to replace the unions. This is the main justification for organizing their phoney NU-WRO. While this concept justifies general anti-unionism in practice, in keeping with its police role, it is aimed solely at the progressive unions who, according to Trotskyite ideology, are always the most dangerous. While supposedly ultra-Left, they have a Right opportunist, Alice in Wonderland, Right social democratic idea of how a revolution takes place.

"The technique for taking over a depression-ridden capitalist economy is similar to the procedure by which bankrupt individual capitalist firms are reorganized (as the Penn Central is being reorganized under the bankruptcy laws today.

There are three factors involved in this takeover: (1) The fact that within capitalism there already exists an administrative apparatus for processing the mass of paper which has to be called in under bankruptcy procedures: the centralized banking system. (2) The fact that the persons who have to do the processing of the paper at each point in the banking system are themselves wage-earners; the clerks and minor officials of banks, insurance companies and so forth. (3) That the agency responsible to issue policy directives and replace the old management is assumed to exist: the organized political labor movement and its allies, capable of electing representatives to assume specific executive duties over the centralized banking system." (from Socialism or Fascism?, published by NCLC, Oct. 1971, p. 18.)

That is, revolution consists of recalling the money and changing managers, and the agencies already exist as capitalist forms to accomplish this.

On youth, one of the key themes of the NCLC is that there is a split between the YWLL and the Party. A great deal of their literature is aimed at widening this supposed division. In their writing, they openly brag of their intention to infiltrate the YWLL. Of significance in this area is their announced intention to form a new youth organization. Where these youths are coming from, we do not know. We can only surmise that the LC has some relations with some lumpen and gang youth. This may be the significance of the arrests in Philadelphia where one of the thugs turned out to be a youth gang organizer which also connected him to the police.

On an international scale they claim to have groups in West Germany and in England. Other facts appear now to tie them to the CIA and the Greek Junta. In addition, they appear to have quite friendly relations with the Fourth International with whom they have carried on a long exchange in their organ, The Campaigner.

Lastly, one of the key aspects of the LC is their attempt to put forward a superman image of ruthlessness and invincibility, and the stupidity of the masses, particularly Black and Brown masses. Such ideology is fascist to the core and, considering their racist position, has implications of "The Aryan Race."

In conclusion on the LC, it must be stated once again that the LC is heavily controlled by police, but without the Trotskyite ideology these police would be paralyzed. Consequently, our struggle against them must be tied to a more aggressive struggle against Trotskyism.

WORKERS WORLD - YOUTH AGAINST WAR AND FASCISM

They have no more than 200-250 members. They have been active for years mainly on international issues, but are now active in the American Servicemen's Union (which has been declining), and in Attica prison reform from which they did grow for a while. They have also set up a womens group and a workers group, both of which are very small. They have members in New York City and in Buffalo.

PROGRESSIVE LABOR (PL) — STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY (SDS)

PL now has roughly 500 members in 16 cities with its main base in Massachusetts and Berkeley. It has sharply declined from three years ago when it led the student-worker alliance of SDS and was building workers councils. Its decline came with the collapse of SDS, with many Black members splitting away charging PL with racism. PL has had some growth recently. One year ago there were 1,000 at the SDS convention. It has been actively working on unemployment, but has not worked on one anti-racism bill. It has urged the movement of "30 for 40" (30 hours work for 40 hours pay) and is doing some work in shops.

PL has a sectarian position on reform and revolution which poses reform struggles against revolution. This, combined with its racist position on the national question makes sizeable advance impossible.

Politically PL has degenerated into a complete Trotskyite organization. Despite the fact that they do not claim to be Trotskyites, this is the total quality of their line, including the typical attacks on Stalin.

They say that nationalism has only one side, a reactionary side,

and that nationalism is the main danger. They attack the Chinese for their supposed support of democratic struggles, their nationalism, and their alliance with anti-imperialist bourgeois forces. They are for no agreement with imperialism or any section of monopoly, and argue that war is the only way to bring about socialism. On reform and revolution, they argue that the two-stage approach is wrong and was wrong from the beginning, even when Lenin put it forward in the Russian Revolution, and that it was wrong in China.

They take the view that racism is only a question of the special oppression of Black and Brown workers and they actively fight against demands which cut across class lines. This led them, for example, to oppose open admission to college because it helps develop the Black bourgeoisie. On this matter they state, "The essence of a program for Black liberation is anti-imperialism... it would steer clear of democratic demands for decentralization, for more Black representation on legislative bodies." They attack the 7th World Congress and Dimitrov as revisionist. They very actively attack Stalin. They state flatly that he was always wrong on all questions, and particularly on the national question. They say the Soviet Union today is led by a new bourgeoisie.

Lately PL has been launching referendum initiatives for 30 hours work for 40 hours pay in California, New York and perhaps other places. They have also begun to colonize shops such as the Lynn Electrical Plant in Massachusetts.

The approximate total of the Trotskyite groups in the United States is now about 3,000-3,500. This represents a significant increase in size and influence despite a recent falling off. The great bulk of this increase is from the SWP-YSA. The general trend for Trotskyism, despite the hatred it has earned from many groups, has been, over the past five years, a growth in influence. Considering the level of middle-class radicalism, the still wide influence of racism and anti-communism, of anti-Sovietism, etc., the SWP still has some room to grow in the future. We should therefore be sharpening our attacks on Trotskyism.

NEO PAN-AFRICANISM

The main concepts of the neo-Pan African movement are the following:

- 1) Based on analysis by color of skin as primary, and not class analysis.
- 2) Rejection of national differences among Black people in African countries.
- 3) Projection of primitive communal society as the basic historic tradition of all Black people.
- 4) The solution to oppression is to build a power base in Africa.

- 5) Advocacy of Black capitalism and the penetration of imperialism into Africa.
- 6) Rejection of Black-white unity.

IMAMU BARAKA

Such concepts as those above are reflected in many of the positions taken by Baraka's Congress of African People (CAP). CAP has about 2,000 members. Its influence seems to be extensive. Baraka rejects the concept that classes exist, either among Black people in the United States or Africa. Thus he states in a recent issue of Black Scholar, "We also believe no ideas or ideology will really make the change we seek unless they are based on a Black value system." The essence of such a value system is put forward in the seven points of Maulina Karenga: Unity, self-determination, collective work and responsibility, cooperative economics, purpose, creativity and faith. While it pretends to be above classes and representing Black people as a whole the fact that it does not discuss property, exploitation, monopoly, etc., shows that it does take a class position. On this point Henry Winston states, "Those like Baraka, who speak of cultural nationalism out of context with the objective and subjective requisites for defeating imperialism are simply throwing dust in the eyes of the masses." (Strategy for A Black Agenda)

Denial of classes, as well as national culture, applies also to Baraka's approach to whites. Thus he places workers and the bourgeoisie as all part of the oppressive white culture. The main thrust, however, is against labor. In his paper, Black Newark, Vol. 2, No. 3, he says, "Chief obstruction at the moment to building Kawaida Towers has not been Tony Imperiale, but the racist unions...the big unions are just like big business, white dominated and racist. Black workers at Martland (hospital) and the Board of Education are being urged now to withhold their union dues until the Teamsters move to support Kawaida Towers. There's even talk about a Black labor union being formed, which would bear more healthy fruit of the struggle. And a welcome and revolutionary move!" Thus Baraka lets monopolies off the hook. Baraka argues for separate Black unions and by so doing, in most cases, leaves Black workers at the mercy of the bourgeoisie.

Baraka denies the Leninist concept that nations are historically constituted and says in Black Scholar 8/72 that: "a nation is simply a large institution," implying that it can be built at will. Such a position is subjective idealism. It implies that Black people are building a nation in the U.S. and throughout the world, and that Africa can be built into one nation. This plays easily into the hands of imperialists who want to economically dominate Africa as well as to suppress the struggle of the various nations in Africa for self-determination. A further idea along

with this is that of dual citizenship which, in the context of Baraka's position, means encouraging Black people in the U.S. to become tools of imperialism in Africa and promoters of the capitalist class at home. Another of Baraka's concepts is that Africa can become a power base in the struggle for equality in the U.S. We will look at this idea closer when we discuss Stokely Carmichael's ideas. Baraka says he is a socialist, but that socialism is "an attitude" and he quotes Nyerere of Tanzania. Henry Winston, in the pamphlet, Strategy for a Black Agenda (pp. 29-30) says:

"When Nyerere says that 'socialism is essentially a distributive system,' he reveals his rejection of scientific socialism for his country, Tanzania. Socialism is based on abolition of capitalist control of the means of production. Nyerere's so-called 'distributive system' would simply allow the means of production to remain in the hands of a developing capitalist class

...
Echoing Nyerere, Baraka calls for 'the African attitude toward distribution of wealth.' And, like Nyerere, his purpose is to divert the mass struggle against the class controlling the means of production - which, in the United States, means the monopolists, who control the entire economy."

Such views are basically reformist and social democratic concepts that distribution is the key point in determining the character of society, not the relations of production. But distribution follows production, not the reverse. Capitalist production with communal distribution is impossible.

Baraka further says, "Ujama, collective or cooperative economics, (is the) traditional way of distributing wealth for the Black man." Such ideas glorify the ancient forms of production in Africa which imperialism has maintained and which the anti-imperialist movement fights to erase. Such ideas serve to justify capitalism in the U.S. and organizing Black business here. But Black capitalism or even real cooperatives cannot solve the problems of Black people. This is because most Black workers work for monopolies, and any program for their benefit must be tied to a struggle to eliminate the monopolies. Cooperatives, unless in the context of a struggle to eliminate monopolies, can go nowhere because the monopolies control the economy and eventually force these cooperatives either out of business or into a subservient position through various means.

STOKELY CARMICHAEL

Although very similar to the view of Baraka, Carmichael's

position is much more hidden under Marxist language. Thus he proclaims himself a "Nkrumah Marxist-Leninist." He too sees basically an analysis by color, not class. He says, "We have seen that poor whites and poor Blacks are incapable of coming together in this country, or when they do come together, we see it is the white man who benefits, and having gained what he wants turns against the Black man." (Stokely Speaks, p. 194) He further states that "superstructure is always based on land. The revolution must be about land." Further, "Mao-tse-tung says this, Ho Chi Minh says this, Fidel Castro says this, V.I. Lenin says this, Osagyefo says this, and Stokely Carmichael, as humble as I am, says this." (Ibid., p.197)

From this Carmichael concludes, "Therefore, where can we get land? I ask you to look with me to Africa." (Ibid., p. 203). Thus, while Carmichael proclaims himself a Marxist, his main work is to distort Marxism. In contradiction to Carmichael, Marxism has always held that the mode of production determines superstructure, and for a socialist superstructure the basic thing is socialist ownership of industry and development of modern industry. Carmichael's position is wrong in both Africa and in the U.S.

Carmichael states, "We can see that the theories of Marx and Lenin have their roots in communalism... Thus, as an African, I should study Nkrumahism which knows communalism contains the very foundation of Marxism-Leninism." He further states, "Nkrumahism knows that if Mother Africa had been left untrampled by alien forces she would have been the first to achieve communalism naturally, without bloodshed." (Black Scholar, Feb. 1973, p. 42.)

Thus Carmichael glorifies primitive economy and aids imperialism in blocking the development of modern industry in Africa. In Stokely Speaks (p. 205), Carmichael advocates building a power base in Africa and says that when there is a united Africa, Black people will be treated with dignity in the U.S. and everywhere. He cites Israel as an example of a homeland which is the base for dignity and equality for the Jewish people. Here his illusions are obvious. The U.S., despite its aid to Israel, remains the number one anti-semitic nation in the world. Despite rhetoric to the contrary, Carmichael does not advocate going back to Africa now, but like Zionism he puts this goal forward as a diversion from the struggle here and now in the U.S. He states, "No, I am not saying we should go back to Africa at this point," (Ibid., p. 206) and further he openly compares his Pan-Africanism and Zionism by saying, "Jews set the precedent in the U.S." He openly calls for guerrilla war, combining legal and illegal work, which is supposed to be different from the past. Here too he represents the Black petty bourgeoisie seeking to ally with imperialism.

BLACK PANTHER PARTY

The Black Panther Party continues to disintegrate. Two hundred

to three hundred members are claimed by Huey Newton despite a large vote for Seale in Oakland, their main base. Newton rejects the past position on the gun, saying they didn't have a sufficient base in the community for it and people were confused. All this is blamed on Cleaver. But the basic non-class position of the Panthers continues. The lumpen proletariat is seen as the main class, and will become the majority. Within the Black community they are very actively pursuing Black capitalism. They now have a shoe factory, eight supermarkets, etc. The newest development is their attitude toward the Democratic Party which reflects an underestimation of the bourgeoisie and an overestimation of the Democratic Party. In a recent interview in Playboy, Newton says:

"I was very impressed with last year's democratic convention. I saw great potential there. It was the first open convention; there were liberal rules made; the people there were progressives. But I wasn't very impressed with their consciousness; they didn't know what they had or how to deal with it. And they had a misunderstanding: They went there under the false assumption that they had taken over the Party. But the 'real' Democrats, the old white Southerners and the big money, had already left the Party... .

At any rate, the proposal came up at the Democratic Convention that they should have a dues-paying membership. And this was voted down in the rules committee. That was a mistake, because if they had created a dues-paying party -- say, five dollars per month per person as an arbitrary kind of figure -- the party would have had money to fight during the next four years, without having to cede control to big contributors. McGovern would still have lost the election, but the party would have had money. A couple of million people at five dollars a month -- that's pretty good money to function on. Then by 1976, with a candidate such as, hypothetically, Cesar Chavez, the Democrats would be stronger than the American Democratic Party, which is the only real party in this country with a physical apparatus and an ideology... .

"...By the time of the next national convention we would have been there with an organized force under the banner of the Democratic Party, which would really then be a socialist party."

There are rumors that the Black Panther Party intends to dissolve into the Democratic Party, but this is a step backwards.

A basic weakness of Newton is his anti-communism. In this

same interview, speaking of the Communist Party, USA, he says:

"They're not a very revolutionary group. They don't DO anything. I mean, so they run their candidate. They're more alienated than we were before we went back to the community. Their ideology is foreign. They're connected up with Moscow. They have no relationship with what's going on here. They have a good apparatus for raising money, and they know how to do it. Their officials have a lot of money. Everyone I've met is pretty well off, very middle-class, you know?"

Speaking of Angela Davis' membership in the Communist Party he says: "I think she must be a fool of some sort."

MAOISM

Maoism is the main ideological trend which, strategically speaking, must be defeated. It is the front runner of all petty bourgeois radicalism in the U.S. It legitimatizes such concepts as: 1) The Soviet Union is a sell-out; 2) the concept of Communist with a small 'c'; 3) opposition to peaceful coexistence; 4) analysis by color, not class; 5) the Third World; and 6) terrorism.

While the main essence of Maoism remains, certain changes have taken place. Its organizational forms -- SDS, Panthers, etc -- have collapsed, and PL has sharply declined. This is part of the general decline of Maoism. Even after the entrance of China into the U.N. it lost ground to a certain degree. Pakistan and Nixon's trip to Peking undermined Maoism among the Left. However, while Maoism has lost ground in the new Left, it has found a new base among certain liberals. In addition, the decline of Maoism in the late 60's is tied to the defeat of terrorist and anarchist trends.

In a sense, Maoism in the U.S., therefore, is wearing something of a new face. The Guardian most reflects this new face. Another new factor is the more direct intervention of the Chinese in the U.S. With their direct aid, there is now a new attempt to form a Maoist party here. China is trying to unite all the ultra-Left into an anti-Soviet, anti-Party alliance. China is the pivot point for this alliance. China Books in New York directly shows this new aspect when it organizes special sects in the U.S. which are anti-Party and anti-Soviet. Many leaders of these groups here are being trained in China.

The Guardian is the open, direct mouthpiece of the Chinese, of the open and direct effort to form a new Maoist party. The Guardian circulation is not known for sure, but they make oblique references to a decline in readers. In a sense, The Guardian

most shows the attempt of Maoism to develop a new face. They have reversed their tactical position on peaceful coexistence. They used to attack the USSR on peaceful coexistence and attack all meetings with the Soviet Union and other countries. Now they are for peaceful coexistence, but not in the "way the Soviet Union carries it out." They say the Soviet Union sees peaceful coexistence as a strategy, whereas China considers it, correctly, as a tactic. But underlying this rhetoric is the same old position which is that imperialism cannot be forced to accept peaceful coexistence. Instead the slogan becomes simply a propaganda maneuver to put off the onus of the impending war on imperialism and to cover various tactical alliances that the Chinese make with imperialism. The important point here is that the rhetoric attracts less the "radical Left" and more the liberals.

Maoism is also tactically playing down the gun position and playing up its image as a peace-loving movement. But here again the essence is the same, anti-Sovietism and capitulation to imperialism. In general, The Guardian covers its positions with radical phrases, but the essence of their positions is that expounded by the liberals and Social Democrats. The Guardian agrees with the classless "two superpowers" concept. They state that the superpowers want to be superior to other countries and lord it over them. China urges a broad united front of countries not dominated by the "superpowers;" that is, the small and medium countries against the big countries. This appeals to liberal and non-class concepts, and capitulates to anti-communism.

The Guardian supports the two-zone theory recently put forward by the Maoists; that is, break Soviet hegemony by supporting independence of countries in the intermediate zone countries. The intermediate zone is seen as two parts; zone one being the Third World countries. Zone two would include Italy, France, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, West Germany -- all those countries now in either NATO or the Warsaw Pact but not completely "controlled" by the U.S. or the U.S.S.R. The goal would be to win them from dependence on the U.S. or U.S.S.R. In practice, it means support to revisionism in the Warsaw Pact countries. For example, The Guardian states, "One aspect of this line was to break U.S. and Soviet hegemony over the world by supporting the independence of small and medium-sized nations in the first and second intermediate zones." (Unite the Many, Defeat the Few, Guardian pamphlet by Jack A. Smith) Opportunist alliances of all sorts flow from this kind of analysis. The Guardian's Jack A. Smith says, "China decided to oppose both existing power blocs, identify itself as part of the Third World and 'to unite all who can be united to oppose U.S. imperialism and Soviet social imperialism.'" (Ibid.)

Another new aspect of the Maoists is to try to stand a little less close to Stalin. Thus, while they use Stalin against the Soviet Union, they are quick to dissociate themselves from him on many questions. They repeatedly state such things as, "The Comintern, although helpful in some ways, committed a number of blunders in relation to the Chinese revolution...this was part due to the fact that Stalin viewed the Comintern as an extension of Soviet

policy...while defending Stalin we do not defend his mistake."

Another theme of The Guardian is that they are for an "independent communist party," free of the domination of the socialist nations, and that the Chinese Party was always independent and didn't take orders from Moscow. Thus, under the left rhetoric, they show complete capitulation to bourgeois anti-communist pressures. (Their position is similar to the Richmond-Gates position.)

In conclusion, while The Guardian mouths revolutionary slogans, the main content of its positions is the merger of various bourgeois liberal ideas with Marxism. The Guardian most clearly shows the capitulationist sides of Maoism which are more glaring with the new tactics of the Maoists. The Guardian attacks the Communist Party's policy of the united front as having validity only in oppressed countries. There can be no "unity" with liberals, etc. Carl Davidson of The Guardian writes:

" 'The anti-monopoly stage' which several delegates referred to is seen by the Communist Party as a necessary transitional stage in this country to the socialist state, or proletarian dictatorship. While this conception has validity in the oppressed nations as part of the national democratic revolution, in the advanced capitalist countries it belongs to a set of views long repudiated by Leninists as social democratic and class collaborationist."

**PUERTO RICAN REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS ORGANIZATION
and BLACK WORKERS CONGRESS**

These are also among the Maoist forces and both seem to be in sharp decline, if not complete disintegration. Neither group puts out literature. The PRWO used to put out Palante but stopped a number of months ago.

The size of BWC is unknown although there were some indications it had from 500-1,000 Black youth around it. However, nothing has been heard from it in almost a year, and it should be said that, while there are signs that it is very weak, some people believe that it is larger than it appears but is underground. A representative did participate in The Guardian Forum on a new party. But few Black people were in the audience which would further indicate its weakness. Recently the BWC said it could not participate in a Guardian forum on the national question because it did not have its position together.

The PRWO has shrunk to about 30-40 members, almost all of whom

are in New York. Their decline is due mainly to their adventurist views on the gun which very closely paralleled the Panthers. Some leaders of PRWO have been in China and since returning have criticized themselves for taking a negative view of the working class and playing up the lumpen proletariat, for playing up the gun and for being too one-sidedly concerned with Puerto Rican independence. Nevertheless, their supposed correction of sectarianism has been very superficial. When PRWO stopped putting out Palante they asked their readers to watch for a new paper soon to which the whole movement could relate...did they mean The Guardian?

REVOLUTIONARY UNION (RU)

The RU now appears to be one of the main forces the Chinese are banking on to build a Maoist party in the U.S. Many RU leaders have been to China for lengthy stays in the past year. The Guardian also depends on RU for the new party. RU has a base in eleven cities. We do not have an accurate picture of its size, but it does not number more than 500. In addition, there is also the Attica Brigade, which they lead, and they have a growing student membership.

The main base of the RU is student or ex-student, although it is extremely active in colonizing shops. A comrade in Chicago estimates that they have 30 youth in shops in Chicago alone. While they still appear to be overwhelmingly white, they call themselves "multi-racial" and are particularly anxious to project an interracial face.

The RU is particularly dangerous because it is the least "way out" and its positions sound most like our own Party's (particularly during the 1920's). They have even reprinted literature of ours from the past.

On the democratic front, they advocate an anti-imperialist front which incorporates the working class, national liberation forces and the petty bourgeoisie. This front sounds very much like the anti-monopoly front, but in fact it is very different despite their call for unity. They oppose any united front with the world communist movement as the war danger.

They argue against "anti-monopoly government:"

"The revisionist adherents of a phony anti-monopoly alliance have developed the 'two-stage' theory in imperialist U.S., probably because they dread the thought of dictatorship of the proletariat, certainly because they are not willing to fight for it."

(Red Papers: 1, 2, 3 - p. 42.)

They are anti-Soviet, anti-communist, and also argue for the

position of legal and illegal work while trying to play down talk of violence. A number of former SDS'ers and former CP youth are in RU, which is one reason their language sounds much like ours. Mickey Jarvis, and ex-party members like Bob Duggan and Don Hammerquist are in or around RU. On the national question they dovetail with the nationalist position that Black people "constitute a nation of a new type." They say "new type" because it doesn't agree with Lenin's definition. They substitute a subjectivist approach and argue that Black people have the right to form a separate state not only in the Black Belt but in any other area of the U.S., including New York, Newark, Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., etc. Thus they state, "We uphold the right of Black people to form a separate state in the 'Black Belt' area. We also recognize that their claim to a state in another part of the country would be equally legitimate." "The Mexican-American people of the Southwest are also a nation oppressed by U.S. imperialism." (Red Papers 19; 1,2,3 - p. 45.)

Their position on the principal contradiction shows complete confusion, a basically vacillating position on the role of the working class. Speaking of the principal contradiction they state:

"Contradictions, like everything else in life, are subject to process and change: What is primary today may develop, dialectically, into the secondary aspect tomorrow. The contradiction between the oppressed peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, and the imperialists has become the principal contradiction since World War II." (Emphasis MZ) (Red Papers-1,2,3 p. 38.)

Thus the RU takes a completely subjectivist position on the main contradiction, arguing that even though the essence of a thing remains the same, its principal contradiction can change.

PUERTO RICAN SOCIALIST PARTY (PSP)

PSP is on the periphery of the Maoist movement. It has a base of about 1,000 members and has led demonstrations of as many as 10,000 in Puerto Rico. In Puerto Rico it is influential mainly among the radicalized sector of students and petty bourgeoisie. In the U.S. it has committed cadre of about 200 and a periphery of varying commitment of about 1,000. It is based in Connecticut, New Jersey, Cleveland, Boston, Chicago, as well as New York. Recently they had a conference of 2,000 people in the U.S. While the main organized base of the PSP is petty bourgeoisie, this conference attracted many working class youths.

Its position on fundamental questions dovetails with Maoism, but it denies that label and says it is not Maoist. In the U.S. it is now the most influential force in the Puerto Rican Left. Nevertheless, the main influence of PSP is not in keeping with its relative

size, due mainly to its sectarian position of not working with those who are not yet for Puerto Rico's independence.

On international questions, it considers the Soviet Union a "degenerate socialist workers' state," with technocrats and bureaucrats in leadership. It used to take a straight Maoist position of denying that the Soviet Union is socialist, but now it has backed off from that view. It wages sharp attacks on the Communist Party of Chile and on the Communist Party of France for their democratic front policy. It supports anti-Allende socialists in Chile, (MIR and anti-Allende forces in the Socialist Party of Chile). On the national question in the U.S., its position is that all Puerto Rican people, wherever they live, are part of the Puerto Rican nation, and not a national minority in the U.S. Thus, despite Left rhetoric, it leaves the electoral field open to liberal forces, such as Badillo. The history of the PSP in the U.S. has been one influenced by a series of ultra-Left groups like student YAWF, PL, SWP, etc. On our Party, they say there is no vanguard in the U.S. and treats the Communist Party equally with the Trotskyites. The PSP calls itself the vanguard party of Puerto Rico and sharply attacks the Communist Party of Puerto Rico as CIA agents. Despite the inherent Maoist trends, the PSP does not openly call itself Maoist because it wants recognition from the world communist movement that it is the vanguard of Puerto Rico. In this regard, they are particularly anxious to have the Cuban Party take such a view. Because of this, they hide their anti-Soviet and Maoist positions under a cloak of ideological neutrality in the Left style. The PSP will not become part of a new Maoist party in the U.S. and has already quit the November 4th coalition.

Our tactics toward PSP must differ from that toward the hard-core Maoist groups. We must engage in sharp polemics but also fight to build united front actions with them on specific programs.

CONCLUSION ON MAOIST TRENDS

The main, immediate problem in this area is the attempt to form a new Maoist party. Judging by the attendance at The Guardian forums, we estimate that possibly 600-1,000 are ready to join the new party, if it were formed today. Nevertheless, if we note the tremendous differences between the different forces who would come together, then we would see that if formed today its potential for staying together is slim. But to guarantee that such a thing is not developed, we must step up polemics against this group. Different than in the past is now the direct participation of the Chinese in the effort. We can therefore assume the effort will not collapse easily despite the defeats clearly suffered.

CONCLUSION ON ULTRA LEFT AS A WHOLE

The membership and periphery of the ultra-Left as a whole is

about 6,000-8,000. While not united, this represents a large group, overwhelmingly middle-class white students and shows the many-sided attack which monopoly is hurling at us.

Within this group there is a division of labor on different points. However, they are all united on the points of anti-Sovietism, anti-labor, against Black-white unity, against democratic front and against our Party. As compared with past periods in the Party's history the ultra-Left is relatively strong and is more cleverly used by the bourgeoisie than before.

* * * *

A "COMING OUT" FOR THE PARTY

Party Affairs recently interviewed Dorothy Rubin and Zita Fearon who are in a Brooklyn community Party club. Their experiences in collecting signatures to put the New York Party candidates on the ballot should be of interest to all comrades because they reveal some real insights into the fight to win respect for the Party on the broadest possible level.

Comrades Zita and Dorothy (according to informed sources - they are too modest to put it this way) have been involved in every conceivable democratic activity and organization in their community for a period of years -- leadership in the women's peace movement, activity in the parent-teachers association, organizations to fight racism in the neighborhood and promoting better Black-white-Puerto Rican relations, independent political action, women's liberation, housing, farmworkers boycott committees, close relations with block and civic associations, Black leaders and many ministers. While they are known to some of their mass work associates as Communists, they, as did most comrades, had the usual fears of open Party activity and playing a leading role in mass activity as Communists. They found through their signature collecting experiences, that the hesitation far from helping their mass work, was an obstacle to their work. They have reached a level in their work where their mass work helps their role as open Communists and vice versa. They are able to talk about their neighbors' problems on a much deeper level and people now expect this of them. People in their mass organizations cannot dismiss them as outsiders because they have known these comrades and know that they are sincerely on their side and work tirelessly on the issues of concern to the community.

Here is the story of their more formal "coming out":

PARTY AFFAIRS: First, would either of you like to comment on the general composition of the neighborhood?

DOROTHY: It has a kind of diverse composition. There are many different ethnic backgrounds. It's an old Irish-Italian working class community, and now there is a large percentage of Black and Puerto Rican residents. There is also a small Asian population, and there has been an influx of young white middle-class people. There's kind of a brownstone renewal taking place. There's also a Puerto Rican ghetto that's part of the community.

PARTY AFFAIRS: How did you select the site for signature collection?

DOROTHY: There's a supermarket in the neighborhood which is known as a place where people collect signatures or hand out leaflets and all kinds of things. And we have been out there several weeks with the Daily World and a petition on Watergate had a very good response. It was only natural to go back there with the Party petition.

PARTY AFFAIRS: What are some of the experiences that made this signature collection more unique?

ZITA: Talking to people that we had known before either casually or through our mass work and now for the first time as members of the Communist Party. There was one gentleman that I was talking to who I had known formerly when I was working on a job in the community as a receptionist for a doctor. This man had been a patient and I was somewhat friendly with him. And after we were talking for a while he asked me, "What are you doing out here?" So I gulped and told him. He said, "Your kidding!" I said, "No, I'm not kidding -- after all I respect your right to have what political opinions you have, and I think you should respect my right to the same." He said, "You know, you're absolutely right, but I can't sign your petition because my job is such that I can't." And then he said, "You know, I voted for Pete Cachione. I got into trouble for it. I remember."

DOROTHY: I ran into an older Black woman whom I had worked with in a housing organization. I opened our conversation by asking her what was happening with the problems in her building. This was a fairly typical opening. We also ran into an ex-Party member who was very delighted to see us there and said he was interested in being contacted by us. He showed a lot of confusion on many issues but showed a lot of enjoyment in being able to discuss these things with comrades.

PARTY AFFAIRS: Did he sign the petition?

DOROTHY: Oh, definitely. One person who came along was the mother of one of the local conservative candidates who is running for office. We always see her with an American flag in her lapel. And she came over to say hello because we helped her out with her tenant problems. And I told her what it was and her son was with her. I asked him to sign the petition. He said, "Well, I can't do that, because the Republican in the area is already mad at me." So he just took a couple of pieces of literature. They were both

very friendly. Concerning the people who didn't sign, the kinds of discussions we had with them I felt were extremely worthwhile anyway and they're people that we will see again. And this is very important. One example was a woman we had known also in the housing struggles and she thought that's what we were out on the street for. And then we told her, "No, we are trying to get the Communist candidates on the ballot." She seemed a little shocked at first and then she said, "Well, you know the way things are going these days this may just be the answer." And she took the Housing Program and showed a great deal of interest in reading it. And we will see her again. This was the most gratifying part of all of it. There was also a large group of various Left people in the neighborhood, and we will see them again. They know us already as people who are involved in the community and we have their respect for our participation in mass struggles. I think there was a certain amount of their not seeing us as Party people and now, seeing our faces as Party people, I think this really helped to rectify this. I think we gained a lot of respect from those people that we met as participating in this and the fact that they saw us out on the street with this as well as with the mass activity. We met a couple of young Black men that we have known from various activities in the community. One of them was reached by an SWP petitioner first, but she didn't know him, so I approached him to talk to him about it. He seemed a little bewildered about what the difference was between us and them, and I said that for one thing we live in the neighborhood and I also asked him if he might be interested in hearing more from us and he said that he would. So, even though we didn't get his signature the contact was renewed and we indicated that we had some discussions around what is happening in Cuba from someone who had recently been there and he showed a tremendous amount of interest in that.

ZITA: There are so many people who would sign that you wouldn't expect to sign and its really important to ask absolutely everybody regardless of the way they look (unless they're drunk). But their age or the way they dress is really not important. I asked one older man who I was fairly certain was going to pass right by and before I finished saying what I was saying, he took the pen right out of my hand and said, "certainly," and he just signed. I saw a rather well-known liberal couple, well known for some of their activities, cultural and otherwise, in the community and I asked -- I don't think they remembered who I was exactly but he said, "Oh, for the Communist Party, sure I'll sign." I was very surprised, but there are people out there, even the people we haven't been working with, but they do recognize us, and they will see us again and they will remember who we are.

PARTY AFFAIRS: So you both agree that its hard to stereotype the kind of people who your going to get a good response from, and those who will turn you down.

DOROTHY: Definitely! I've gotten to the point now where I ask absolutely everybody that I can possibly snag walking down the street because we really will never know. I'd say that as a rule younger people are more responsive, but it's not all that much greater a probability. Appearances don't tell.

ZITA: We take our laundry to one of these places every Saturday -- my husband takes it in. So the laundry man came walking by and my husband went up to him and asked him if he would sign for the Communist Party. He said, "Sure I'll sign."

DOROTHY: There was another tenant who has been getting help from this group I'm working with, and he came by and I was somewhat trying to avoid discussing with him what I was doing. We were just setting the table up and we were talking about what was happening with him and so on. Finally he said to me, "What have you got over there?" I said, "We have a petition to put the Communist Party on the ballot." He said, "Oh, ok." So, he signed.

PARTY AFFAIRS: Did you have any experiences with people who were afraid to sign our petition?

ZITA: Yes, I had a couple of experiences, but in a way I was really surprised at how few people expressed fear and used that as a reason for not signing. A few people, while they were signing, asked, "Well does this get me on any list?" And I responded, "My goodness, you really do want to be on Nixon's enemy list, don't you? You'd hate to be left off!" And they laughed and agreed.

PARTY AFFAIRS: How would you characterize this whole experience?

DOROTHY: We all found it very exhilarating and very exciting and we felt that we were making greater contact with our community, the people who live there, and whom we've known over a number of years. The basic atmosphere was extremely favorable. Even those who didn't want to sign were generally polite and very often thought about what we had to say and were willing to take literature and read more about it. The basic response was just tremendous.

PARTY AFFAIRS: How do you think this will affect your mass work in the future?

DOROTHY: In general, a number of people in our mass work have known that we are Communists. This will increase their knowledge and also begin to relate the Party's electoral program to other mass work that we have been involved in. And I think it can only help.

ZITA: I think it makes the mass work much more meaningful when you know that what you're doing you're doing as a Communist and that people see the work. You have the feeling that you're not drowning in the mass work and that it has an effect that's going to last beyond the immediate work that you're doing.

DOROTHY: I think this is a sign of the times. I think a few years ago it would have been much more difficult. I find that I'm amazed by the amount of change in the atmosphere. It's really a new period, and it's really a time for us to seize now.

PARTY AFFAIRS: Was this an isolated experience or were more comrades in your club involved in neighborhood canvassing?

DOROTHY: Most of the comrades in the club have been involved and everyone has come out with very positive reactions. There were one or two people who went outside the neighborhood but also had a very good response.

PARTY AFFAIRS: Zita, we understand that you were one of the pace-setters during the Hall-Tyner campaign and that you personally got more than a thousand signatures. So as a very experienced canvasser, what was different or new about your experience in your own neighborhood?

ZITA: Well, the only kind of thing that worried me when I was out with the Hall-Tyner campaign was that people would say to me, "You don't come from this community. You only come here to collect signatures." It was true that I was not from that community even though I had wished that I was able to do community work there. But here in our own neighborhood no one can say that "you don't work here or you don't come from here." It's a totally good experience. Also the experience of the club as a whole, its more of a collective kind of activity, and everybody has a good feeling about it because we're doing it together and in our own territory.

PARTY AFFAIRS: What kind of literature did you use in canvassing?

ZITA: The same kind that we used in the Hall-Tyner campaign; we used the Daily World and we had literature on the campaign. Some of the leaflets that were put out during the campaign we made into a package and put the leaflet in with the Daily World. The Daily World is really invaluable for collecting signatures and for having follow-up on signatures. Then we also asked people if they wanted subscriptions and got a couple of subs. And it happened that this has worked; people have come back a second time. We got a couple of subscriptions like that in one neighborhood. We really hope to increase our circulation in our own neighborhood.

PARTY AFFAIRS: Other than the fact that you ended up with people's signatures and addresses, were there more concrete ones for future contacts?

ZITA: Oh yes, there were several people who appeared to be interested and were told about our contact list of community people and we asked them if they would like to come to any affair that we would have, or classes, and several people seemed to be interested and asked specifically to be put on our contact list.

* * * *

LABOR AND POLITICAL ACTION: CANADA AND THE U.S.

By George Meyers, Chairman,
National Labor Commission

State monopoly capital's blatant use of government intervention in labor-management relations on the side of the corporations has increased with every new stage of the crisis of U.S. imperialism. The wage freeze swindle, anti-strike court injunctions, Administration threats directed at unions engaged in contract negotiations, giant corporate tax rebates and outright gifts are just a few examples.

This situation, along with the Democratic Party debacle in the 1972 presidential elections and other factors, especially the stench emanating from Watergate, are forcing rank and file workers and a growing number of trade union officials to realize the need for more effective independent political trade union forms than now exist. Recognition of the need for a labor "breakaway" from the two-party system of big business is growing. Earlier illusions that C.O.P.E. could be an effective weapon of organized labor in the political arena are rapidly dissipating. Controlled by present AFL-CIO reactionaries, it has turned into a fiasco with dwindling support from AFL-CIO affiliates, especially since its pro-Nixon role in the last elections.

In the search for more effective political forms that are now emerging, some unionists see the New Democratic Party of Canada (NDP) as a possible prototype of what is needed in the United States. Roughly speaking, the NDP is a reform party led primarily by petty bourgeois elements but with an important official trade union base. It presently controls several Canadian provinces and has grown to become the balance of power that gives the Trudeau government a voting majority in Parliament.

As you comrades know, our Party is a long-time advocate of a "breakaway" popular mass political party with its base in the organized labor movement. Recent meetings of the Central Committee have taken note of the ripening situation in the country that makes this an "idea whose time has come." In view of the fact that we can learn from the experiences of our sister Party in Canada, with whom we have so much in common, we would like to call your attention to the following excerpts from an article by Comrade Ben Swankey that appeared in the May-June issue of Canadian Viewpoint, a Marxist theoretical and political journal which presents the Communist position, and with it, the following excerpt from the Party Programme

of the Communist Party of Canada.

"The defeat of monopoly capitalism requires unity of the working class and other democratic forces in a new political alliance. The Communist Party works for such a new political alliance, a democratic, anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist alliance, based on the working class, the national and democratic forces in Canada, the farmers, the middle strata, the non-monopolist bourgeoisie, all those affected by monopoly policies. The New Democratic Party is not THE democratic alliance -- it is part of it. Such a political alliance will include the Communist Party and the New Democratic Party, democratic people's organizations in English and French Canada, the trade unions, farm organizations, youth and student organizations, associations of intellectuals and professionals, women's organizations, cooperatives. The Communist Party works to unite all these democratic forces as the basis for a democratic, anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist people's government, in which the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party will play a decisive role." (Party Programme, Communist Party of Canada, pp. 45-6.)

As you will see, our Canadian comrades take a positive view of the NDP. At the same time they see it as anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist only to the extent that its leaders are pushed by developing rank and file movements within it, and the changing relationship of forces.

Following are excerpts from Comrade Ben Swankey's article, "Communists and the NDP:"

Communists see the road to socialism in Canada as consisting of two stages. The first is the formation of a broad people's alliance led by the working class and its socialist vanguard, and directed against the big monopoly corporations that dominate our society, and successfully competing for political power with the election of a people's majority in Parliament. The chief task at this stage is to curb and undermine the throttling power of the big corporations and to introduce far-reaching economic and social reforms. The second stage involves a socialist revolution and it could be achieved through a relatively peaceful transition to socialism. The main task here is to completely eliminate the power of the big corporations, to firmly

establish the rule of the working class and to proceed to build a society free from the exploitation of man by man -- socialism.

Unity of the working class is essential to the building of such a broad people's coalition. This requires unity not only of the trade union movement, but equally important, unity of all the socialist forces, and first of all of the Communist Party and the New Democratic Party. This unity will be achieved only in the course of struggle against the rule of the big corporations. The fact that such unity may yet be some time off makes our steps in this direction all the more urgent. Our efforts can bring the future closer.

From this standpoint it may be helpful to review our approach to social democracy, its role, and the new possibilities for unity in the changed circumstances of today. If we advance ideas that are already well known to experienced Communists, it is hoped that they will still be of interest to the new members joining our ranks and to those within the NDP or supporting it who sincerely seek unity of the socialist forces.

Characteristic Features of Social Democracy

Social democracy is a political force and ideological trend in the working class movement of capitalist countries and is influential in some of the most advanced capitalist states such as Great Britain, Sweden and West Germany. Its main expression in Canada is the New Democratic Party.

The basic features of social democracy include:

- Denial of the class nature of society and therefore of the class struggle.
- Denial of the role of the state as the instrument that the ruling class uses to maintain power and to suppress other classes contending for political power. Its theory is that the state is neutral and stands above classes and that it is not necessary to destroy or replace the present capitalist state apparatus to bring about fundamental social changes.
- Denial of the leading role of the working class, or of the need for working class unity, or of the need to establish working class rule to build socialism.
- Support for policies of class collaboration, that is, joining with the Establishment in support of policies that are against the interests of

the working class. In domestic affairs this is expressed, for example, in trade union practices that result in sell-outs to the employers and in support for policies of wage controls. In foreign affairs it is expressed in support for aggressive policies of imperialism.

- The theory that reforms within capitalism will ultimately lead to some form of "socialism." This is reformism, the theory that the revolutionary transformation of society is unnecessary. Social democracy sees the struggle for reforms not as a means to an end, but as an end in itself. Its theory and philosophy does not go beyond the introduction of reforms within capitalism.

- Denial of the need for forms of struggle other than parliamentary struggle which for it is limited to supporting social-democratic candidates. When faced with the demand for struggle to secure immediate improvement, its answer invariable is "Wait till the next election and vote for us."

- Support for policies of opportunism -- the sacrifice of the long-term interests of the working class for narrow sectional or partisan advantage. A good example of opportunism by the NDP is its refusal to recognize French Canada as a nation and to support the struggle of the French-Canadian people for national self-determination. The attitude of the NDP to French Canada is essentially the same as that of the Liberals. Its stand is motivated by a fear of losing votes in English Canada among those who have anti-French Canadian prejudices, as well as its fear of offending the Establishment and the unfavorable criticism to which it would then be subjected by the corporation-owned mass media.

- Anti-communism is one of its major policies, expressed in red-baiting in and out of the trade union movement and violent hostility to the socialist world.

- Support for the theory that capitalism in the postwar years has undergone fundamental change, and that it can be adapted to serving the needs of the people. ("The strident socialism and the strident capitalism of 30 years ago don't exist in British Columbia," NDP Premier Barrett of B.C. recently told The Province in an interview.)

- Equating public ownership under capitalism with socialism.

These are some of the basic features of social democracy that to one degree or another (and they vary not only with each country but also within each country) apply to most social democratic parties in the world.

The program which the NDP adopted at its founding convention in 1961 offers some examples to illustrate these features, as does the 1972 federal election platform of the NDP.

Nowhere in the NDP program is there any mention of the working class as such, or of the class struggle, or of the leading role of labor or the trade unions, or of the class nature of capitalist society.

Adopting the phraseology of the propagandists of U.S. imperialism, the NDP program affirmed that "In the struggle between democracy and totalitarianism, Canada...must stand squarely on the side of freedom and with the forces of freedom." To this end the program welcomed "the creation of the Common Market and its prospective expansion" and praised NATO for having "played its part in the maintenance of West European security."

In the same vein the 1972 election platform of the NDP promised that the NDP government will not act to "abandon traditional friends or allies." While calling for an end to the war in Vietnam, no mention is made of the criminal responsibility of U.S. imperialism for this war. Instead this is sluffed over and imperialism excused for its crimes with the statement that "in Vietnam and elsewhere the real enemy of world peace is not conspiracy but human misery."

No NDP member of Parliament ever voted against the huge armament expenditures annually included in the defense budget.

In criticizing the NDP and social democracy generally for its attitude to reforms we do not by any means reject this struggle - on the contrary we are in the front lines of every struggle for meaningful reforms. But we regard the struggle for reforms as an integral part of the struggle to replace capitalism with socialism.

To struggle only for reforms leads in the direction of reformism. To struggle only for socialism leads in the direction of sectarianism and adventurism.

The NDP is out to make Canadian capitalism work more efficiently, the Communist Party is out to abolish capitalism and build a socialist Canada - that is the essential difference between a reformist and a revolutionary party.

The leadership of the NDP is basically middle class (petty bourgeois) as are its elected representatives at the various levels of government. Among them are few trade union leaders. In the NDP provincial government of

B.C. there are two trade unionists in the cabinet but not one top leader of the powerful B.C. Federation of Labor was permitted to be a candidate in last summer's provincial election.

The NDP has built a mass base through the advocacy of reform and through the introduction of reforms while in office. Medicare and government auto insurance in Saskatchewan are one example. In B.C. reforms in education, increased pensions, and measures for the controlled use of land are further examples.

Social democracy tends to gain support during periods like the present when there is a trend to the left. Sections of the population become disillusioned with the old-line parties and opt for moderate reforms as advocated by the NDP. Social democracy also benefits from the fact that many otherwise militant workers when election time comes around vote for the NDP rather than Communist candidates, not because they have faith in the NDP but because they feel it has a better chance to get in and to defeat the old-line party in office.

But social democracy has no monopoly on reforms. Capitalist governments (Liberal, Conservative and Social Credit) also introduce reforms when it suits their purpose as a means of gaining support for themselves and heading off movements to the left. The liberal unemployment insurance reforms introduced by the Trudeau government prior to the last federal election are an example of this.

The introduction of reforms, especially when they come from the top and not as a result of an obvious mass struggle, tend to perpetuate reformist illusions among the people, including the working class.

Right-wing social-democratic leaders accept and regard as their central task that of fighting the influence of the Communist Party at home and the socialist world abroad.

Right-wing leaders of the NDP in Canada have followed a similar course of action. They supported the Cold War policies of U.S. and Canadian imperialism against the socialist states. They joined in drives to expel Communists and militants from the trade union movement and to expel whole unions from trade union centres. In the last provincial election campaign in B.C., NDP Leader Dave Barrett didn't hesitate to come out with the falsehood that a secret deal existed between Social Credit and the Communist Party to defeat the NDP.

Among the social-democratic parties of the world, the party of Canadian social democrats, the NDP, can be said to be one of the right-wing parties. The election of David Lewis (a long-time, hard-line, right winger) as national NDP leader at its 1971 national convention marked a further shift to the right by the NDP.

This should not prevent us from seeing, however, that under the pressure of the growing movement for peace and against the brutal aggression of the U.S. in Vietnam in particular, the NDP has had to change or at least modify some of its Cold-War positions, and come out against Canada remaining in NATO and NORAD and for an end to U.S. intervention in Indochina. The reforms introduced by NDP provincial governments in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and B.C., sometimes in the face of violent opposition of right-wing forces, are further evidence of the pressure from below, of the demand for progressive change by the working class and the people.

Communist-NDP Unity

Our severe and continuing criticism and exposure of reformism and opportunism as practised by right-wing leaders of NDP do not prevent us from taking a positive stand toward the NDP.

"The Communist Party sees the NDP as a social-reformist party which fulfills a positive role in challenging the monopoly of the two old-line capitalist parties, in detaching working people from their influence and furthering the process of independent labor-farmer political action." -- (Road to Socialism in Canada, Program of the Communist Party, p.44.)

Tim Buck, in his book, Canada: The Communist Viewpoint, published in 1948, made the same point (p. 150):

"The establishment of the CCF (predecessor of the NDP) constituted an important stage in the evolution of Canadian politics. Its electoral gains indicate a prospect, for the first time, that the monopoly of national government, hitherto enjoyed by the two parties which directly represent the interests of monopoly capital, will soon be broken. Breaking the monopoly of the two old parties will be an historic development for Canadian democracy."

We stand for and we continuously strive for unity of the NDP and the Communist Party. We regard NDP workers as our class brothers.

"The Communist Party works for the closest cooperation with the New Democratic Party around immediate aims and objectives....The Communist Party works systematically for cooperation and the united front with the New Democratic Party in defense of the vital interests of the working class, the struggle for peace, democracy, Canadian independence, and against monopoly rule." (The Road to Socialism in Canada, pp. 44,45.)

In our work for unity we endeavor to establish close and friendly relationships with left-wing groupings within the NDP.

There has always been a left wing within Canadian social democracy with varying degrees of strength at

different periods. It reflects the pressure from below for working-class policies as opposed to policies of class collaboration. It opposes efforts to make the NDP similar to the old-line parties. Big sections of the NDP have never abandoned their desire for socialism even though it is no longer stated as a programmatic objective.

In more recent times the left wing within the NDP coalesced for a period into the so-called "waffle" wing of the party, which managed to secure the support of about one third of the delegates at the 1971 national NDP convention for more realistic and progressive policies. Since then its strength has been dissipated, contributing factors being its failure to recognize the leading role of labor, the anti-communism of some of its leaders and the withdrawal of some into a new organization parallel to the NDP.

In B.C. the Waffle group has been infiltrated and has aligned itself with Trotskyite elements both within and outside of the NDP.

The formation of a left wing is inevitable within social democracy. Our Program makes a special point of this.

"The sharpening of the class struggle inevitably leads to a process of differentiation in the NDP, and the emergence of a left wing of the party. This differentiation creates more favorable conditions for cooperation in the building of the united front against monopoly and for socialist policies."

With the intensification of the class struggle which is now taking place, we can expect that the process of differentiation within the NDP will also increase.

The left wing of the NDP includes a variety of trends and viewpoints -- those who seek unity with other progressive forces, those who want socialism as they see it, those who want anti-monopoly policies and are disturbed by the class-collaboration policies followed by right-wing NDP leaders, and many still imbued with anti-communism. Vacillating policies have always been a characteristic.

Many NDP members and supporters are moving to the left today, as part of a trend to the left in Canadian politics. To bring together the left forces within the NDP and the trade union movement is one of the major responsibilities and opportunities awaiting us today. Good possibilities exist for developing united-front activity with NDP members and with the NDP itself on many issues and in many fields. And particularly in those provinces where the NDP is in office, it should be possible to develop a public dialogue in a new way on what socialism is and how it will be achieved.

The election of NDP provincial governments in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia was an important advance for the working class and the people of these

provinces, as well as for Canada as a whole. We support all progressive measures taken by such governments. In B.C. we have set ourselves the aim of doing all we can to keep B.C. moving left, to help develop working-class and public pressure that will move the NDP government beyond social welfare reforms and into legislative action that will tackle the citadels of economic power in this province, the big corporations that dominate and exploit our rich resources. Our objective is to build a broad movement against monopoly under the leadership of the working class that will include the NDP as a decisive part as well as our Party.

If we start from the proposition that the realization of this objective requires consistent struggle, we can look forward to the future with optimism. While the historic tendency of social democracy and its right-wing leadership is to act as a brake on the forces which seek fundamental social change, objective changes in the world today are narrowing down the possibilities of social democracy fulfilling that role. The Communist-Socialist unity achieved in France, Finland and Chile are promising examples of this change.

The new objective changes in the world which make possible the relatively peaceful transition to socialism and the prevention of a third world war also make possible the perspective of the changed role of social democracy, of social-democratic parties going over from policies of reformism and class collaboration to class policies, to joint Communist-Socialist unity in the struggle to curb the monopolies and for socialism.

This proposition is advanced in a pamphlet recently issued by Novosti Press entitled Communists and Social Democrats under the joint authorship of V. Vasin, S. Gribanov, and I. Undasynov.

"It is becoming increasingly possible," they declare, "for social democracy to take a new path of development as a mass political force -- to go over from reformism to struggle, with the object of democratizing the socio-political system, ending the dominance of the monopolies in economic and social life, and using the apparatus of economic regulation in the interests of the working people." (p. 26)

It is with this perspective in mind that we should review and improve our efforts to achieve Communist-NDP unity in the struggle to curb the monopolies and for socialism.

* * *

DUBOIS VS. PADMORE AND WASHINGTON

By Naside Henderson, Pittsburgh, Pa.

In an article appearing in Muhammed Speaks, August 24, 1973, by Donald Mosby titled, "No Surprise, DuBois Tapes at University of Massachusetts," Mosby levels an attack against Mrs. Shirley DuBois, the late W.E.B. DuBois and the Communist Party U.S.A. via an attack upon its National Chairman, Comrade Henry Winston.

The basis of the article is Mosby's outrage that DuBois' writings will be sold to the University of Massachusetts (DuBois' home state) and not to an all Black college or university. This writer will not present an argument in favor or against the decision of Mrs. DuBois; however, it should be pointed out that it was her decision to make and with good reason.

The important thing here is the attack and its nature. Mosby states in his article, "Dr. DuBois was an avowed integrationist. How, then, could he be the 'Godfather' of the Black nationalist movement?" The question is a fair one and the answer is simple. DuBois was not the "Godfather" of Black nationalism. Nor, in fact, did he make that claim. However, DuBois was the "Godfather" of the Pan-African movement and of what he called Pan-African socialism. DuBois wrote, "The new series of Pan-African congresses would seek common aims of progress for Black Africa, including types of political control, economic cooperation, cultural development, universal education and freedom from religious dogma and dictation." (The World and Africa, DuBois, International Publishers, New York, 1965, p.296.) These are not aims of an integrationist seeking to destroy the tide of the African revolution. Nor are they the aims of a capitalist-oriented Black leader. Further, integration is not the issue (nor should it be). The real issue is the unity of the working class united with its chief ally, the Black liberation movement, in the struggle for progress and meaningful change, i.e., Socialism.

In his article, Mosby attacks DuBois for his criticisms of the late Booker T. Washington's Atlanta cotton exposition speech. Mosby states, "In Washington's famed 'fingers of the hand' speech, he stated the proposition that Black people were more than willing to accept social separation from whites. DuBois attacked Washington for this position." Indeed, Washington was "more than willing" to sell out the best interests of Black people for a handful of gold.

In fact, when Washington said "Black people," that's all he had in mind. He wasn't speaking in behalf of himself, who to the white ruling class was the single most important Black person in America at that time. Further, it should be noted that so-called social separation from whites meant separation in jobs, housing and social services as well, none of which were adequate to meet the needs of Black people in the first place. James G. Steele writes:

Another significant feature of historical importance with respect to Booker T. Washington lies in the fact that the "Atlanta Compromise" and the Tuskegee Machine have been the ideological underpinning and political substance for every subsequent reactionary nationalist movement in the Black liberation struggle. This is true of Garveyism, the reformist social democratic civil rights organizations, Black capitalism and even Pan-Africanism (of the Padmore-Garvey-Carmichael-Baraka type.)

It is paradoxical that many Black movements have denounced the Washington school without having learned its lessons. It is not in the "rap" or high-sounding militant-like phrases by which a movement or figure should be judged, but rather by its class substance. (James G. Steele, World Magazine - Daily World, March 31, 1973, p. M-11, "The Harmful Legacy of Booker T. Washington.")

Mosby has not rejected Washington; on the contrary he has made him a revolutionary of the highest order. Thus, he continues his attack on DuBois: "DuBois was in the forefront of Black opposition to Marcus Garvey and the entire U.N.I.A. concept." "Black opposition" is correct. Black people understood their stake in this country; it was Black blood, sweat and tears that helped build the United States. Why then should Black people leave? Marcus Garvey was incorrect. Moreover, racists did not oppose Garvey. In fact, the Ku Klux Klan was more than willing to help him and the "Black Starship Line" on its way. Garvey went as far as to speak to and with open enemies of Black people. Anytime you can see eye to eye with your enemy, something is wrong with your strategy. Mosby's strategy for Black liberation is social separation from progressive whites or, in short, to give up the struggle for full equality at home in exchange for so-called renewed relationships (Garveyism) with Africa. James G. Steele continues:

No one opposes solidarity of Black Americans with Africa, provided that it is a critical unity; that is, unity with African Liberation, not dialogue with racist South Africa or other neo-colonial plots. The Pan-African trends propose no such anti-imperialist unity. They, like Washington, simply say 'Cast your buckets down

where you are.' U.S. imperialism welcomes this 'unity' with the winking smile of its dollar sign.

Moreover, this trend affirms what is worst in previous Pan-African movements. They reject the anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism of W.E.B. DuBois. They glorify the anti-communism of George Padmore, in spite of the statements on international solidarity and the goal of national reconstruction by the outstanding leadership of most African liberation movements. (James G. Steele, op. cit.)

DuBois based his relationship with Africa on terms that ruled out colonialism, imperialism and racism. He called not for social separation, but for social liberation. He understood and fought for socialism here as well as in Africa. In this connection he wrote:

Pan African socialism seeks the welfare state in Black Africa. It will refuse to be exploited by people of other continents for their own benefit and not for the benefit of the peoples of Africa. It will no longer consent to permitting the African majority of any African country to be governed against its will by a minority of invaders who claim racial superiority or the right to get rich at African expense. (DuBois, op. cit., p. 297.)

MOSBY'S ATTACK ON WINSTON

Unlike Washington, DuBois was working day and night for the freedom of Black and working peoples the world over. Mosby openly rejects any such struggle. He attacks the most outstanding Black leader who is the National Chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., Henry Winston, for his "glowing tribute to DuBois' belief that all working class people of the world must unite in opposition to the common enemy - capitalism." In Mosby's classless eyes, white people, not capitalism, constitute the problem. Thus the anti-communist nature of his neo-Pan-Africanism gives it its "revolutionary" tone, making a hero of George Padmore and an enemy of DuBois, when in reality the opposite is true. Winston relates the following: "Unlike Padmore, DuBois never departed from the conviction that anti-imperialist struggle demanded unity with the Soviet Union and all oppressed and exploited classes and peoples of every race on earth." (Henry Winston, Strategy for a Black Agenda, International Publishers, p. 45 and 46.) Mosby goes on to say that he in no way wants to "minimize the many contributions DuBois made to the Black struggle," but just wants to place DuBois "in his true relative position to present day Black nationalists who have chosen him as a 'Godfather'". In this regard, Mosby fails. He not only "minimizes the many

contributions" DuBois has made but belittles Black people in the process.

DuBois' book, The Souls of Black Folk, (1903), was a turning point in history for Black people. Therefore Black history, life and contributions cannot be understood in isolation from DuBois book. "One can better, for example, understand the significance of a book such as his The Souls of Black Folk (1903); the very title of the book, affirming that Black folks have souls, will carry greater meaning to the person who understands the context and society within which it was produced." (Herbert Aptheker, Political Affairs, July, 1973, "U.S. Imperialism and Racism: A History.") Similar recognition of the contribution of DuBois' The Souls of Black Folk was given by Melvin Drimmer when he said, "When did Negroes reject this negative vision of themselves and begin to reassess their own history? I would like to suggest that the starting point began with the publication of W.E.B. DuBois' The Souls of Black Folk." DuBois' book had a great impact upon young Negro intellectuals. James Weldon Johnson, himself one of the important figures in the creation of this new Negro image, recalled in his autobiography, Along This Way (1935), that DuBois' book "had a greater effect upon and within the Negro race in America than any other single book published in this country since Uncle Tom's Cabin." Since its publication, The Souls of Black Folk has passed through more than thirty editions. It proved to be, as the Nashville Banner predicted, "dangerous for the Negro to read, for it will only excite discontent and fill his imagination with things that do not exist, or things that should not bear upon his mind." (Melvin Drimmer, Black History: A Reappraisal, Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968, p. 2).

Mosby would have us believe that W.E.B. DuBois was an "Uncle Tom." In fact, that's what the white ruling class would have us believe as well. DuBois was in essence the most outstanding leader of the 20th century, not just another "integrationist." His teachings gave birth to the first Pan-African Congress in Paris in 1919. His works span some 40 volumes and they are known the world over. Unlike Padmore, Washington, and for that matter, Mosby, DuBois was a stand up fighter for the freedom of Black people, not their separation from other people. DuBois joined the Communist Party with the understanding that "capitalism cannot reform itself." Mosby thinks it has and that all that is left is to "reform" Black nationalism. Here is where the plot thickens and Mosby pulls the sheets off himself. He writes:

Early in this century, DuBois wrote, 'The problem of the 20th century is the problem of the color line.' It is now clearly apparent that DuBois' solution to the problem for Black people to cross over the line into that fabled 'mainstream' of white America.

The "color line" was erected by racists. You cannot cross over racism; you destroy it. Racism is the main ideological weapon of the ruling class and thereby its weakest point. To destroy racism

means, in short, to unite the forces of social progress, i.e., to bring about an anti-monopoly coalition in this country. That coalition will be led by Black and working class people, not the "fabbed 'mainstream' of white America." Further, Mosby has nothing to say about the struggle for Black liberation or against racism. Indeed, he has singled out DuBois for special attack, never turning his pen to the Nixons, Daleys, etc. Mosby continues:

DuBois was an exponent of the 'talented tenth' concept which stated that Black people should strive hard to educate that tenth of the race who were most talented and depend on them to 'aid and comfort' the rest of us.

We would ask Mosby just where he read the words above quoted. He should be aware of the fact that DuBois fought hard and long (80 years) for the education of Black people -- in fact it was DuBois who pointed out as far back as July 1910 that Black people during the period of reconstruction played the major role in the development of public education in the South. He wrote:

There is no doubt but that the thirst of the Black man for knowledge -- a thirst which has been too persistent and durable to be mere curiosity or whim -- gave birth to the public free school system of the South. It was the question upon which Black voters and legislators insisted more than anything else and while it is possible to find some vestiges of free schools in some of the southern states before the war, yet a universal, well-established system dates from the day that the Black man got political power. (W.E.B. DuBois, "Reconstruction and Its Benefits," in Black History, Melvin Drimmer, p. 289.)

Again, these are not the words of a man concerned with educating only the so-called "talented tenth." Further, an educated tenth of the Black population in the fields of science, industry, etc. at the turn of the century would have been a historical first. DuBois, however, ridiculed imperialism for its "white man's burden" concept, saying if theirs was real concern for Black self-rule, why not educate one tenth of the Black population to undertake the job? Therefore, DuBois didn't propose it, he rejected imperialism as the mis-educator of Black and all peoples; the destroyer of education!

As point #3 of Black peoples' demands, DuBois wrote, "3. Education in self-knowledge, in scientific truth, and in industrial technique, undivorced from the art of beauty." (African Communists Speak, DuBois, "The Birth of African Unity," 'Nauka' Publishing House, Moscow, 1970, p. 32.)

Africans raised similar demands at the third Pan-African Congress in 1923: "4. Free elementary education for all, broad training in modern industrial technique, and higher training of selected

talent." (Ibid, p. 34.) The Fourth Pan-African Congress stressed point #3, "Modern education for all children." (Ibid, p. 35.) Needless to say, the word "all" means not one-tenth -- talented or otherwise! As if the above wasn't bad enough, Mosby goes on to say, "To his dying day, DuBois strove to bring about an accommodation between Africa and Communist Russia. Indeed, to bring Communism to Africa." Unlike Mosby, DuBois understood the importance of the October Revolution. He understood that the long chain of imperialism had been broken, thus making freedom easier to reach for all oppressed peoples.

USSR—MODERN SYMBOL OF FULL EQUALITY

The October Revolution of 1917 showed the way for oppressed peoples. The U.S.S.R. was formed in 1922 bringing for the first time in history freedom and full equality of all formerly oppressed peoples. A new state had been born. The October Revolution opened the door for underdeveloped countries to bypass the capitalist stage of development in the transition to socialism. DuBois loved the Soviet Union; he visited it three times. Following his first trip in 1926, he wrote these long to be remembered words:

I have walked miles of streets in Leningrad, Moscow, Nizhni, Novgorod, and Kiev at morning, noon and night. I have trafficked on the curb and in the stores; I have watched crowds and audiences. I have gathered some documents and figures, plied officials and teachers with questions and sat still and gazed at this Russia, that the spirit of its life and people might enter my veins.

I stand in astonishment and wonder at the revelation of Russia that has come to me. I may be partially deceived and half informed. But if what I have seen with my eyes and heard with my ears in Russia is Bolshevism I am a Bolshevik. (Mason & Smith, Lenin's Impact on the United States. "DuBois on his Visit to Soviet Russia," New World Review Publications, New York, 1970, p. 168.)

DuBois further understood that the Soviet Union was the modern symbol of freedom and its leadership came from the great Lenin, teacher of the working people. Notwithstanding these truths, DuBois taught Black Americans to struggle today and look forward to tomorrow. He never rejected the progress Black people made in the U.S. (unlike Mosby) but always called for their total freedom, expressed in the emancipation of labor, both Black and white.

In his book, John Brown (1909), DuBois added in later years:

There can be no doubt that the progress of the emancipated slave in the United States since

1863 has been phenomenal. He has touched every phase of American development. He has furnished subjects for American writers and thinkers and himself contributed to American art, music, and literature. He has given the nation invaluable labor and service, has taken noteable part in the advance of science and discovery and without his work, American industry could never have reached the heights which it has. The American Department of State in its desperate effort to fight socialism and communism has sought to emphasize Negro progress and has paid out considerable sums of money to bribe Negroes and induce them to travel and praise America in various parts of the world. Despite this however it is perfectly clear that while Negro progress has been great, it has not been nearly as rapid as it might have been had the Negro received decent treatment. He has been deliberately paid a lower wage than whites doing the same work or than immigrants from abroad. He has been denied preferment and promotion in industry, kept out of scientific laboratories, discriminated against in scholarships and often actually beaten to submission to superior force and impudent assumption. If American Negroes had been given the chance that the Russian peasant has had since 1917, his contribution to the uplift of the world might easily have been startling. The repression and discrimination which he has met has held back the progress of the United States and the world and is a thing of which this country must always be ashamed. (John Brown, International Publishers, New York, 1967, p. 400 and 401.)

Thus, the holding back of Black people has in the long term hindered the advance of the entire country, whites included. However, the new twist to an old rubberband is Mosby's rejection of the African national liberation revolution from behind the dirty sheet of anti-communism. Mosby's anti-communist, counter-revolutionary rejection of DuBois' anti-imperialism could only exacerbate the struggle for peace and to ease world tensions. In short, Mosby has become the chief theoretician for the stupid revolution, of which he should be "ashamed!"

And Mosby's last and final paragraph reads:

When one examines DuBois' life, then it becomes readily apparent why his papers were sold to the University that they were. It is indeed significant that DuBois was born in Great Barrington, Massachusetts. Neither Garvey nor Washington had the childhood

advantages DuBois had. One could surmise that this accounts for the vastly different philosophies of the three - or could it be analogous to the 'house slave and the field slave' once again?

The significant thing lies in the fact that DuBois lived for the cause of oppressed peoples. His teachings and spirit live on in the hearts of revolutionaries the world over. For Mosby to call DuBois a "house slave" could only indicate that he himself is a traitor of a new type. How else can one justify such an uncalled for attack on one of history's greatest figures? The difference in philosophies is the difference between revolutionaries and petty-bourgeois nationalists (like Mosby). If one were to take political stupidity and ideological unclarity, it would be equivalent to Donald Mosby.

* * *

PARTY SHOP PAPERS—A PERSONAL, DIRECT APPROACH

By LJB, New York, N.Y.

A recent issue of the Daily World contained a short article by George Meyers, Chairman of the National Labor Commission of the Party, on shop papers and their importance to our work in every field. This article was a real eye opener inasmuch as it focused attention on the importance of this medium generally and particularly when mass rank and file movement in the basic industries is developing throughout the country.

The question of Party shop papers has a long and very informative history in our movement. Shop papers have been a tremendous impetus towards the organization of the unorganized in the thirties and since. No other media has such a personal approach to the shop and industrial workers as the shop paper generally and especially if the issuance of the paper is a steady proposition and is expected by the workers in a particular shop or factory every week or as often as it appears. The shop paper, besides raising the immediate question of conditions in the shop, the democracy in the particular union and other such questions, also raises political questions, and last but not least, the face of the Party and its relationship to the many and complex problems appearing on the labor horizon.

A copy of the steel shop paper issued in Ohio was a welcome sight. It means that the Party in Ohio and probably in other areas is beginning to revive and bring into action one of its most important voices before the industrial workers right on their door steps in a

language which is really basic, minus the rhetoric that we sometimes use.

There is no better and direct spokesman in the campaign for industrial concentration than the voice of the basic shop paper appearing regularly.

I am writing these few lines because I have had experience in this field and can recall the benefits for our movement as a result of shop papers. It is important to remember that prior to the CIO drive to organize the unorganized into industrial unions, our Party in some of the industrial areas of the country carried on an active campaign towards this goal. I remember in particular our activities in one important steel town, Bethlehem, Pa., where I was stationed. We put out a weekly four page shop paper there called The Crucible which made history in its own small way resulting in subs for the Daily Worker and recruits for our Party. The two shifts used to look forward to getting our Crucible. Hence, when the CIO organizers first appeared in Bethlehem, they came to us because we had already established some base for industrial organization and prepared two workers for unionization.

The need for shop papers is great. The issues facing U.S. industrial workers in the Nixon-Meany period demand that our voice be heard from coast to coast. The Party must, therefore, nationally raise this question to make this a must issue in all of the areas where mass industries exist. The time for rhetoric is over. The time for talking about building the Party in mass industries, too, is over. The time now is for action instead of resolution. So let's follow what Ohio is doing and let's see our shop papers spread the message of our Party.

* * *

IMMEDIATE ACTION ON CHILE:-

We must get unions, churches, fraternal, community and campus organizations to publicly denounce the murderers who have taken over Chilean democracy. We must demand:

- Kissinger intervene to save Luis Corvalan's life
- End the terror, the executions and book burnings
- Break diplomatic relations with Chile's illegal fascist military junta
- Withdraw all U.S. military personnel, CIA and financial support from Chile
- Break off trade and commercial relations with the junta
- Free the imprisoned patriots. Free all foreign exiles to the country of their choice
- Restore the human rights, civil liberties and trade union organizations of the working people of Chile
- Support the struggle of all anti-fascists of the Popular Unity front in their battle against fascism in Chile
- Restore the Popular Unity Government
- Open Congressional hearings on the role of the CIA and ITT in the coup - (Write your Congressman and Senator Fullbright)